

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
WAYCROSS DIVISION**

ANTONIO BATTLE,

Plaintiff,

v.

WAYCROSS DIVISION; COFFEE  
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY; BUREAU OF  
PRISONS; CLAYTON COURTS; and  
SHERIFF,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 5:16-cv-4

**ORDER and MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Plaintiff, currently an inmate at Coffee Correctional Facility in Nicholls, Georgia, filed this cause of action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. After review, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. (Doc. 2.) Further, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff's Complaint, without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and the Court **DENY** Plaintiff *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

**PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS**

Plaintiff filed this Complaint on January 8, 2016, while he was housed at Coffee Correctional Facility. (Doc. 1.) In his Complaint, Plaintiff does not actually make any allegations against Defendants. Rather, he merely states that the Northern District of Georgia issued an Order in another case which advised Plaintiff, that if he desired to pursue claims pertaining to Coffee Correctional Facility, he must do so in this Court. (Doc. 1, p. 5.)

## DISCUSSION

### I. Section 1915(g)

A prisoner proceeding in a civil action against officers or employees of government entities must comply with the mandates of the Prison Litigation Reform Act (“PLRA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1915. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) of the PLRA provides:

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Furthermore, dismissals for providing false filing-history information and failing to comply with court orders both fall under the category of “abuse of the judicial process,” which the Eleventh Circuit has held to be a “strike-worthy” form of dismissal under § 1915(g). See Rivera v. Allin, 144 F.3d 719, 723 (11th Cir. 1998); Malautea v. Suzuki Motor Co., 987 F.2d 1536, 1544 (11th Cir. 1993) (characterizing failure to comply with court orders as “abuse of the judicial process”). Section 1915(g) “requires frequent filer prisoners to prepay the entire filing fee before federal courts may consider their lawsuits and appeals.” Rivera, 144 F.3d at 731. The Eleventh Circuit upheld the constitutionality of Section 1915(g) in Rivera. In so doing, the Court concluded that Section 1915(g) does not violate an inmate’s rights to access to the courts, to due process of law, or to equal protection, or the doctrine of separation of powers. Rivera, 144 F.3d at 721–27.

A review of Plaintiff’s history of filings reveals that he has brought at least three civil actions or appeals which were dismissed and count as strikes under Section 1915(g) before filing this action:

- Order, Battle v. Bureau of Prisons, No. 1:15-cv-4001 (N.D. Ga. Dec. 29, 2015), ECF No. 4 (terminating case for failure to state a claim);
- Order, Battle v. Bureau of Prisons, No. 1:15-cv-3991 (N.D. Ga. Dec. 29, 2015), ECF No. 4 (dismissing case for failure to state a claim);
- Order, Battle v. D.A. Ass'n Of Ga., No. 1:13-cv-2955-SCJ (N.D. Ga. May 29, 2014), ECF No. 15 (dismissal for failure to state a claim); and
- Order, Battle v. Ga. Legislature, No. 1:12-cv-03344 (N.D. Ga. July 24, 2013), ECF No. 13 (dismissal for failure to comply with court order).

Because Plaintiff has filed at least three previously dismissed cases or appeals which qualify as strikes under Section 1915(g), Plaintiff may not proceed *in forma pauperis* in this action unless he can demonstrate that he meets the “imminent danger of serious physical injury” exception to Section 1915(g).

“In order to come within the imminent danger exception, the Eleventh Circuit requires ‘specific allegations of present imminent danger that may result in serious physical harm.’” Odum v. Bryan Cty. Judicial Circuit, No. CV407-181, 2008 WL 766661, at \*1 (S.D. Ga. Mar. 20, 2008) (quoting Skillern v. Jackson, No. CV606-49, 2006 WL 1687752, at \*2 (S.D. Ga. June 14, 2006) (citing Brown v. Johnson, 387 F.3d 1344, 1349 (11th Cir. 2004)). General and conclusory allegations not grounded in specific facts indicating that injury is imminent cannot invoke the Section 1915(g) exception. Margiotti v. Nichols, No. CV306-113, 2006 WL 1174350, at \*2 (N.D. Fla. May 2, 2006). “Additionally, ‘it is clear that a prisoner cannot create the imminent danger so as to escape the three strikes provision of the PLRA.’” Ball v. Allen, No. 06-0496, 2007 WL 484547, at \*2 (S.D. Ala. Feb. 8, 2007) (citing Muhammad v. McDonough, No. CV306-527-J-32, 2006 WL 1640128, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. June 9, 2006)).

Plaintiff should not be excused from prepaying the filing fee because of the imminent danger of serious physical injury. Rather, Plaintiff's Complaint does not contain any factual allegations but merely recounts an order from an unspecified case in the Northern District of Georgia. Therefore, Section 1915(g) bars him from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this case. Should Plaintiff choose to prosecute these claims while incarcerated, he must bring a separate action and pay the full filing fee.<sup>1</sup>

## **II. Leave to Appeal *In Forma Pauperis***

The Court should also deny Plaintiff leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.<sup>2</sup> Though Plaintiff has, of course, not yet filed a notice of appeal, it would be appropriate to address these issues in the Court's order of dismissal. Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (trial court may certify that appeal is not taken in good faith "before or after the notice of appeal is filed").

An appeal cannot be taken *in forma pauperis* if the trial court certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3). Good faith in this context must be judged by an objective standard. Busch v. Cty. of Volusia, 189 F.R.D. 687, 691 (M.D. Fla. 1999). A party does not proceed in good faith when he seeks to advance a frivolous claim or argument. See Coppededge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962). A claim or argument is frivolous when it appears the factual allegations are clearly baseless or the legal

---

<sup>1</sup> Moreover, even if Plaintiff were not barred by Section 1915(g), his Complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim. Additionally, Plaintiff misrepresented his litigation history in his Complaint (Doc. 1, pp. 2–3.) The Eleventh Circuit has consistently upheld the dismissal of cases where a *pro se* prisoner plaintiff has failed to disclose his previous lawsuits as required on the face of the Section 1983 complaint form. See, e.g., Redmon v. Lake Cty. Sheriff's Office, 414 F. App'x 221, 226 (11th Cir. 2011) (*pro se* prisoner's nondisclosure of prior litigation in Section 1983 complaint amounted to abuse of judicial process resulting in sanction of dismissal); Shelton v. Rohrs, 406 F. App'x 340, 341 (11th Cir. 2010) (same); Young v. Sec'y Fla. for Dep't of Corr., 380 F. App'x 939, 941 (11th Cir. 2010) (same); Hood v. Tompkins, 197 F. App'x 818, 819 (11th Cir. 2006) (same). Thus, multiple reasons support dismissal of this action.

<sup>2</sup> A certificate of appealability is not required in this Section 1983 action.

theories are indisputably meritless. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 327 (1989); Carroll v. Gross, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). Or, stated another way, an *in forma pauperis* action is frivolous and, thus, not brought in good faith, if it is “without arguable merit either in law or fact.” Napier v. Preslicka, 314 F.3d 528, 531 (11th Cir. 2002); see also Brown v. United States, Nos. 407CV085, 403CR001, 2009 WL 307872, at \*1–2 (S.D. Ga. Feb. 9, 2009).

Based on the above analysis of Plaintiff’s action, there are no non-frivolous issues to raise on appeal, and an appeal would not be taken in good faith. Moreover, as a “three striker”, Plaintiff is not only barred from filing a civil action *in forma pauperis*, he is also barred from filing an appeal *in forma pauperis* while he is a prisoner. Thus, the Court should deny him *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. (Doc. 2.) Further, I **RECOMMEND** that the Court **DISMISS** Plaintiff’s Complaint, without prejudice, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) and the Court **DENY** Plaintiff *in forma pauperis* status on appeal.

The Court **ORDERS** any party seeking to object to this Report and Recommendation to file specific written objections within **fourteen (14) days** of the date on which this Report and Recommendation is entered. Any objections asserting that the Magistrate Judge failed to address any contention raised in the Complaint must also be included. Failure to do so will bar any later challenge or review of the factual findings or legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). A copy of the objections must be served upon all other parties to the action. The filing of objections is not a proper vehicle through which to make new allegations or present additional evidence.

Upon receipt of Objections meeting the specificity requirement set out above, a United States District Judge will make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report, proposed findings, or recommendation to which objection is made and may accept, reject, or modify in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. Objections not meeting the specificity requirement set out above will not be considered by a District Judge. A party may not appeal a Magistrate Judge's report and recommendation directly to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. Appeals may be made only from a final judgment entered by or at the direction of a District Judge. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to serve a copy of this Report and Recommendation upon Plaintiff.

**SO ORDERED and REPORTED and RECOMMENDED**, this 16th day of February, 2016.



---

R. STAN BAKER  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA